

Mazama gouazoubira as an incorrect subsequent spelling and *M. gouazoupira* (Fischer, 1814) as the correct original spelling, though I would agree that this was not a positive contribution to stability. However, until recently there was no procedure to conserve a preferred emendation other than by appealing to the Commission. This Gardner has now done, and very clearly. He should be supported.

The new Code (4th Edition), laying clearer emphasis on stability, renders these exercises unnecessary in the future by providing a firm distinction between a nomen oblitum and a nomen protectum (Article 23.9): between the original but almost universally rejected or ignored spelling and the generally accepted spelling. One will no longer see the unsupported statement that an original spelling is a lapsus in such examples as the following: *Tadarida teniotis rueppellii* (*Dysopes rüppelii* Temminck, 1826), *Callicebus brunneus* (*Callithrix brunea* Wagner, 1842), *Procolobus badius temminckii* (*Colobus temminckii* Kuhl, 1820), *Vulpes rueppellii* (*Canis rüppelii* Schinz, 1825), *Hendecapleura* (*Endecapleura* Lataste, 1882), and *Myomyscus verreauxi* (*Mus verroxii* A. Smith, 1834). These emendations are likely to be nomina protecta. Perhaps it is worth indicating that a correction to spelling in itself is not necessarily going to become a nomen protectum: Rosevear's (1969, p. 201) emendation of *Tatera welmanni* (*Taterona welmanni* St Leger, 1929) to *T. welmani* on the grounds that the taxon was named after J.B. Welman has not been supported in the literature, and there is no move to emend *Equus chapmani* Layard, 1865, named after J. Chapman. Clear distinctions must be made between (a) misspelled names whose status has not been challenged and which should remain valid; (b) neglected original spellings whose restoration has not been challenged; (c) widely used emendations which become nomina protecta under the new Code; and (d) rational emendations which have not been adopted in the literature and therefore remain unjustified.

Additional references

- Ellerman, J.R. & Morrison-Scott, T.C.S. 1951. *Checklist of Palaearctic and Indian mammals 1758 to 1946*. 810 pp. British Museum, London.
- HersHKovitz, P. 1982. Neotropical deer (Cervidae). Part 1. Pudus, genus *Pudu* Gray. *Fieldiana Zoology*, **11**: 1-86.
- Jenkins, P.D. 1987. *Catalogue of Primates in the British Museum (Natural History) and elsewhere in the British Isles*, part 4 (Suborder Strepsirrhini). 189 pp. British Museum (Natural History), London.
- Rosevear, D.R. 1969. *The rodents of West Africa*. 604 pp. British Museum (Natural History), London.

Comment on the proposed conservation of LORISIDAE Gray, 1821 and GALAGIDAE Gray, 1825 (Mammalia, Primates) as the correct original spellings
(Case 3004; see BZN **55**: 165-168; **56**: 73; **57**: 51)

Jeffrey H. Schwartz

*Department of Anthropology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh,
Pennsylvania 15260, U.S.A.*

Jeheskel Shoshani

*Department of Biological Sciences, Wayne State University, Detroit,
Michigan 48202, U.S.A.*

Ian Tattersall

Department of Anthropology, American Museum of Natural History, New York, New York 10024, U.S.A.

Elwyn L. Simons

Duke University Primate Center, 3705 Erwin Road, Durham, North Carolina 27705, U.S.A.

Gregg Gunnell

Museum of Paleontology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, U.S.A.

Friderun Ankel-Simons

Department of Biological Anthropology and Anatomy, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27705, U.S.A.

In their request to the Commission to reject our proposal to conserve LORISIDAE and GALAGIDAE as the correct original spellings, Groves & Jenkins (BZN 57: 51, March 2000) rest their argument on the use of LORIDAE and GALAGONIDAE in 'at least four influential works' that appeared subsequent to Jenkins's (1987) resurrection of the latter two family names. One of these publications (McKenna & Bell, 1997) would have incorporated the names LORISIDAE and GALAGIDAE had the application, which was submitted in 1995, not been delayed by other matters before the Commission. But, more importantly, we suggest that if the spirit of the Code to maintain stability is to be upheld, LORISIDAE and GALAGIDAE should be conserved as the correct original spellings not only for the reason, as we demonstrated in our original proposal, that with extremely minor exceptions these have been the predominant spellings in the primatological literature, but also because they continue to be the forms used in those recent publications that are and will have the most impact on current and future students of primates. Since Jenkins's (1987) publication, LORISIDAE and GALAGIDAE (and/or LORISINAE and GALAGINAE) have been used, for example, by Martin (1990), Conroy (1990), Fleagle (1988, which was replaced by Fleagle, 1999), Delson et al. (2000, which superseded Tattersall et al., 1988), and Ankel-Simons (2000), all of which constitute primary sources for both the teaching and research activities of those who specialize in primate studies, which span the gamut from systematics to paleontology, ecology and behavior. The widespread use of these influential works in teaching at the undergraduate as well as graduate level in the production of future generations of primate specialists adds further to the need to maintain stability in nomenclature. We should also mention that LORISIDAE and GALAGIDAE (and/or LORISINAE and GALAGINAE) remain in use in the nine most popular undergraduate textbooks in biological and physical anthropology. In addition, Nowak (1999), which is a standard reference work on living mammals, continues the long-standing tradition of recognizing these familiar family-group names. Of course, this discussion does not include the many articles published since 1987 that use these family (and/or subfamily) names.

The Commission is requested to accept our proposal.

As for the spellings of the names for other primate groups that Groves & Jenkins mention, INDRIDAE (for 'INDRIIDAE'), STREPSIRRHINI (for 'STREPSIRHINI') and HAPLORRHINI (for 'HAPLORHINI'), we purposefully chose not to include discussion of them in our original proposal in order not to complicate matters. We had intended to bring these issues before the Commission following our original proposal. Since, however, Groves & Jenkins have now introduced these items, we must point out that all but one of the primate reference works cited above that continue the tradition of using LORISIDAE and GALAGIDAE (and/or LORISINAE and GALAGINAE) also continue the tradition of using STREPSIRHINI, HAPLORHINI and INDRIDAE as the correct spellings. In addition, in his widely used human evolution text, Conroy (1997) maintains the spellings STREPSIRHINI and HAPLORHINI in his background review of the major subdivisions of Primates. Thus, the arguments we made in our original proposal as well as here to preserve LORISIDAE and GALAGIDAE also apply to the conservation of STREPSIRHINI, HAPLORHINI and INDRIDAE as the correct spellings.

Additional references

- Ankel-Simons, F. 2000. *Primate anatomy*, Ed. 2. Academic Press, New York.
- Conroy, G.C. 1997. *Reconstructing human origins: a modern synthesis*. Norton, New York.
- Conroy, G.C. 1990. *Primate evolution*. Norton, New York.
- Delson, E., Tattersall, I., Van Couvering, J.A. & Brooks, A.S. (Eds.). 2000. *Encyclopedia of human evolution and prehistory*, Ed. 2. Garland Publishing, New York.
- Fleagle, J.G. 1999. *Primate adaptation and evolution*, Ed. 2. Academic Press, New York.
- Nowak, R.M. 1999. *Walker's mammals of the world*, Ed. 6. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Tattersall, I., Delson, E. & Van Couvering, J.A. (Eds.). 1988. *Encyclopedia of human evolution and prehistory*. Garland Publishing, New York.